

## **AVIATION FORUM**

**12 November 2013**

PRESENT: Councillors John Lenton (Chairman), Malcolm Beer and Alan Mellins.

Regular Attendees: Peter Hooper, M Jamieson and Mike Sullivan.

Officers: Terry Gould, Wayne Coles and Rob Cowan.

### **PART I**

#### **ITEM 1 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Bathurst.

#### **ITEM 2 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **ITEM 3 - MINUTES**

**RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 27 August 2013 be approved subject to the following –**

- **Item 7: that discussion point 5 reads “the issue of Alliances was raised, particularly as it had been tried to take an Alliance out of Heathrow to another airport”. Discussion point 6 reads “... it was estimated that a larger number of people could use Heathrow...”. Discussion point 7 reads “...where it stated in the report about several miles of new railways would be needed linking to the South West rail system...”**
- **Item 8: that discussion point 1 reads “... such as planes lowering their wheels...”**

#### **ITEM 4 – MATTERS ARISING**

The Forum agreed to consider matters arising as the meeting progressed.

#### **ITEM 5 – FEEDBACK ON WRAYSBURY PUBLIC MEETING HELD ON 11 NOVEMBER**

The Forum received feedback regarding the Wraysbury Public Meeting held on 11 November 2013. 80 people were expected however approximately 500 people attended. The attendees were well behaved and well tempered.

Very few people were against development in the South East. The general consensus at the meeting was Heathrow Airport was acceptable in its current state

and no one was calling for Heathrow to close, however no one wanted more runways at Heathrow.

Complaints were also voiced about Gatwick Airport. It was noted that the current management at Gatwick did not want more than 2 runways however the Forum noted that the management and ownership structure at Gatwick was very complex and because of this what the management had decided was potentially subject to change further down the line.

The Forum noted that the price of an additional runway for Heathrow would, according to Heathrow Ltd, cost £18 million, compared with Gatwick's estimate of £6 million.

The Forum considered the maps of the Heathrow runway proposals that were used at the meeting. It was noted that the maps were very detailed and could be blown up in size to make them easier to read.

Councillor Beer suggested the proposed flight plans be imposed onto the maps and use this as a display item. He also noted that the published maps were deficient in that they finished right on the edge of the proposed runway and so did not show how the runway affected the local communities nearby.

It was noted that more detailed information was available on the relevant website and supplied file.

The Forum noted that the flight plans which would use the proposed new runway would affect historical and cultural landmarks such as Rangers' Gate, St Andrew's Church, the Magna Carta Site and the Beaumont Building.

The Forum also considered the need for information on the altitudes of planes approaching and leaving the runway to be incorporated into any display items as well as including sites of special interest. It was confirmed that the maps would require different layers of information. The Forum was also keen for display items to be easier to read than the maps used at the meeting which were very complex.

The Forum discussed the compensation that would be available to those affected by a new runway. Rumours had been circulated of compensation as high as 150% of the property value, regarding property that would have to be demolished. The Forum noted however that this was more likely to be 110% of the value of the property.

Those properties that would not be demolished but which would be greatly affected by their close proximity to the runway would receive some compensation by way of a bond for noise mitigation and blight. It was still to be determined who would finance the bond and what the security for the bond would be. The Forum was keen for further information on this, such as parent company guarantees. This however would be unavailable until after the Aviation Commission had been completed.

It was noted by the Forum that there was little in the immediate proximity of the proposed runway, known as the Public Safety Zone (PSZ), as it missed most of Wraysbury.

It was also noted that flight routes would not turn until they were past Windsor which would mean that an extended area of the Borough would be affected by noise pollution due to the low altitude of the planes.

The Forum discussed the need to compare current runway alternations with the runway alternations proposed for the new runway proposal. The Forum noted that this had been considered at the meeting but it had not made a great deal of sense and therefore required further analysis.

The Forum noted that the Aviation Commission had requested Heathrow Airport to propose a site for a fourth runway scenario in addition to their building a third. The Forum considered that Heathrow would most likely not wish to commit to a fourth runway for financial reasons, however it might have to if Commission made such a recommendation and this was adopted by the Government of the day.

It was noted that Heathrow expected both Gatwick and Heathrow to gain permission to build one runway each. Councillor Beer questioned the validity of this statement, suggesting that Nigel Milton had overstated this at the meeting.

Councillor Beer also complimented Andrew Davies on chairing the meeting, describing the ground rules as being clearly defined and the questions being kept to a crisp two minutes with no butting in. Councillor Beer did note however that on completion of Nigel Milton's presentation, the images on the screen were removed when in fact it would have been preferable for them to have remained on the screen.

The Forum noted that Chris Nash, Team Leader, Environmental Protection, at RBWM gave a very good presentation which considered air pollution, noise and wide noise. Criticism was received after the meeting suggesting the officer should have focused more on Wraysbury, however the Forum agreed that as an officer of the Borough, Mr Nash was correct not to give special favour to only one part of the Borough.

The Forum noted that the meeting which began at 7.30pm, concluded at 9.30pm.

#### ITEM 6 – RBWM PUBLIC AVIATION MEETING

The Forum considered the RBWM Public Aviation Meeting took place on 22 November 2013.

The Chairman suggested the need for a new venue as the Guildhall, Windsor was considered too small. He said that either the meeting would have to be ticketed to limit the number of attendees or be moved to a larger venue capable of holding 500 people. The Forum considered a number of possible venues however the general consensus was that Windsor Girls' School was the most suitable venue as it was known that the Windsor Boys' School was booked out on 22 November 2013.

The Forum was keen to keep the meeting as an open meeting.

Councillor Mellins questioned how many people were likely to turn up. The Chairman suggested that the number would probably be less than that of the meeting 11 November 2013 as this had been very well publicised and took place in Wraysbury which would be directly affected by a new runway at Heathrow. Though the number would be less at the meeting on 22 November 2013 the number of attendees was expected to be greater than the capacity of the Guildhall.

If an alternative venue was unavailable the Forum agreed to discuss ticketing the meeting with the Guildhall as the venue. It was agreed that this would be preferable to cancelling the meeting.

It was noted by the Forum that Mr Adam Afriyie MP would be in attendance at the meeting. The Forum noted Mr Afriyie's letter which outlined possible action for Heathrow to downgrade to a regional airport, however it appeared that this position had now changed.

The Forum considered the Agenda for the meeting. It was agreed that the Chairman would Chair the meeting and Terry Gould; Adam Afriyie MP; Mr Nigel Milton (Heathrow Airport); and Councillor David Burbage would address the meeting with a Question and Answer session at the end.

The Forum agreed that Councillor Burbage should give the Borough's political perspective at the meeting, challenging the 'Dominant Hub' theory as it increased the number of lights and was not serving more routes but in reality it was just minimising losses for the airport. Furthermore it was not good for the environment.

#### ITEM 7 - BACK HEATHROW CAMPAIGN

The Forum discussed the Back Heathrow Campaign and noted the questionnaire which had been circulated by the Back Heathrow Campaign.

Councillor Beer was critical of the Borough's response to the questionnaire, as RBWM had done nothing to tackle the issue. Concern was raised that, as a result, residents might think the RBWM was indifferent to the campaign which was not the case.

Views were expressed that the questionnaire might be construed as a legitimate survey. It was suggested that a polling company should analyse and report on the lack of legitimacy of the questionnaire. This could then be publicised on appropriate websites. It was noted that other Councils had tackled the problem however RBWM in comparison had done nothing and this needed to be addressed.

It was noted by the Chairman that the Airports Commission would be most unlikely to give any weight to the survey. As a result, the Forum considered the need to wait until after the Davies Commission had published its interim findings before moving forward with the Borough's own campaign as the Commission's findings would determine the nature of any RBWM.

## ITEM 8 – AIRPORTS COMMISSION UPDATE

The Forum received an update regarding the Airports Commission from Councillor Beer.

The Forum noted that a report was due between 17 and 19 December 2013. High level publicity had been created by London First to influence the report's conclusion in favour of increased flights in and out of Heathrow. However, the Forum noted that even Heathrow Airport was against London First's proposals as the 'fly around' would cause logistical problems.

Further to this, it was confirmed that Heathrow Airport had stated concerns regarding Gatwick Airport's proposals.

It was also noted that the Airports Commission would produce a further report to consider this and a schedule of work had been published. As a result of this a further public meeting would probably be required when the interim report was published. The Forum required one month to consider the report therefore the meeting would take place in early 2014. The Forum noted the need to publicise the meeting in the press.

## ITEM 9 – RBWM RESPONSES TO AIRPORTS COMMISSION

The Forum noted RBWM's response to the Airport Commission.

The Forum noted Terry Gould's letter of 27 September 2013 to the Airport Commission, which took issue with Heathrow's proposals. The matter formed a late Cabinet item which received huge support from Members. The letter incorporated comments from West Windsor Residents Association, Wraysbury PC and the views of the Aviation Forum technical working group.

The Forum noted 'Discussion Paper 05: Aviation Noise' which was the result of a collaboration with LAANC members. This paper echoed the sentiments of the Mr Gould's letter to the Airports Commission. The paper was described as a good result resulting from good collaboration. Councillor Beer noted it was a case of different responses giving the same message.

## ITEM 10 – SIR HOWARD DAVIES SPEECH

The Forum noted Sir Howard Davies' speech. The Forum compared the Airports Commission's statement to the comments of RBWM.

The Forum also noted the response of the Old Windsor Parish Council; this was described as consistent with the response of the Borough.

Peter Hooper, a Windsor resident, noted that the Heathrow expansion of the 'Toast Rack' (Central Terminal Area) was in addition to the proposed runway, as opposed to one or the other as Heathrow wanted to develop both.

The Forum noted the difference in planes being used by airlines at Heathrow. The larger A380 was described as selling poorly as fuel consumption was high unless fully loaded and loading times were greater as a result of the larger size.

It was noted by the Forum that the impact of expansion would have an effect on terminals' infrastructure. This was noted as being an issue regardless of whether a new runway was built.

Councillor Beer informed the Forum that planes were only reaching 70% of their capacity and therefore an extra 30% capacity was still available.

#### ITEM 11 – OPERATIONAL FREEDOMS TRIAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY HAL AND CAA

The Forum discussed the Operational Freedoms Trial Recommendations created by Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) and the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA).

The Forum noted that Heathrow wanted to increase operational freedoms.

The Forum noted that the Airport was limited to 480,000 air transport movements per year. However if the proposed new runway was built this would increase to 740,000 air transport movements per year.

The Panel noted that the Airport had introduced an operation named 'TEAM'; Technically Enhanced Approach Mode, whereby if a 20 minute delay was anticipated, the Airport could allow planes to land on either runway, as opposed to the runway specified in the Alternation Procedure. Under Operational Freedoms this delay period had been reduced to 10 minutes and the airport had proposed allowing this practice to be used as when it deemed it necessary.

The airport was considering operating one runway exclusively for landings and a second runway just for take offs. The airport was limited by planes both arriving and departing on the same runway which slowed the traffic of planes. However if one runway dealt with arrivals only and another runway dealt with departures the rest bite period would be removed and more planes could come and go.

This was currently with ministers for consideration with all plans laid for the go ahead. The issue would be considered by the Airports Commission and the Secretary of State would make a decision.

The Forum discussed the use of A380s on the Southern Runway. These were nosier than suggested and the airport could only bring two of these in in the same amount of time it took 3 smaller planes. It had been suggested if the A380s were shuttled around this would be speeded up.

The Forum considered whether the Airports Commission was about capacity or operations. The Chairman confirmed it was broader than just capacity.

Councillor Beer noted that two reports produced by Heathrow had been created however due to there being too much information the reports failed to integrate and

did not provide compatible results. As a result, no overall conclusion had been reached.

Terry Gould noted the Commission's terms of reference which stated the 3 key objectives of the commission as nature and scale to maintain airports, improve existing runways, and consider the long term options and extra credible options.

It was noted that the Noise and Track group had reported back on OFT recommendations however these had never actually been signed off by the Local Authorities. The CAA had looked over their recommendations and made comments though this had not produced anything conclusive. Nevertheless, Heathrow wished to use these reports to grant further operational freedom, despite the report suggesting no real benefit was gained from such freedoms.

#### ITEM 12 – CRANFORD UPDATES

The Forum received a verbal update on the Hillingdon planning application to abolish the Cranford Agreement at Heathrow Airport. It was noted that the application remained undetermined. The Forum noted that this issue was running behind schedule as it was supposed to be published in August. Once a recommendation was received, it would go to ministers for approval.

#### ITEM 13 – NIGHT FLIGHTS

The Forum discussed night flights arriving to and departing from Heathrow.

Mr Gould informed the Forum that he had seen the 'Night Flight Restriction Consultation', a Department of Transport (DoT) document, which considered night flights and confirmed that there were no sweeping changes. It was noted that changes were on hold for seven years until after the results of the Airports Commission were received. However the use of language was noted as being very carefully crafted. Terminology such as limit rather than reduce was employed to give a slightly different meaning.

It was noted by the Forum that the current regime of night flight numbers and quotas would be maintained until 2017. Additionally, there would be greater control on noisier airplanes. The time period where certain noisier aircraft could be scheduled would begin from 23.00hrs instead of 23.30hrs as it had been previously. It was hoped that sustainable growth would be achieved at pre-recession levels.

Mr Gould stated he was still formulating a response to the documentation he had seen, however he had concerns regarding the noise cap. It was noted that this had remained the same despite it being reported as not being fully utilised.

The Forum noted that health aspects were beginning to be considered. Consultations with the World Health Organisation had begun and UCL were researching the impact of Wide noise.

The Forum noted that Heathrow had considered the cost and benefits of night flights. However it was unclear how cost had been defined. This could mean the cost of mitigation, cost to the NHS, or just money to pay for the operation. Regarding benefits, a CBI report has been published which states each route to a new market was worth an estimated £128,000,000 pa in export opportunities.

It was noted by the Forum that the matter of night flights would be a matter for Parliamentary debate. The Forum noted that this was therefore a question for Mr Adam Afriyie MP. It was requested that the Forum ask the Aviation Commission for their timescale. It was noted that if an MP asked a minister a question, they had to provide a response within 10 days.

The Forum also noted that the B747 aircraft was being phased out and that the 'Dreamliner' was being introduced. It was questioned whether this meant there would be a consequential increase in the number of night flights as it was quieter on both landing and takeoff. The Forum also questioned why noise quotas had to remain high if flight noise was supposed to be lower. It was concluded therefore that the document allowed a large amount of flexibility.

The document also noted a number of trials that would take place over the next three years. It was noted by the Forum that people had to be notified about these trials. It was noted that a noise mitigation trial had been running 4-5 weeks before people knew about it and therefore they needed to be well publicised by RBWM.

Another trial which would take place was a trial for the redistribution of flights from 05:00hrs to 06:00hrs as well as a trial to test the effectiveness of the Easterly Preference.

The Forum also noted that work was still to be done on the second stage consultation. There were specific questions at the back of the document and responses would need to be drafted over the up-coming weeks.

The Forum also noted that a Cabinet report would be published 30 January 2014 and that there was a need for a technical working group or special meeting on the matter.

#### ITEM 14 – WIDENOISE UPDATE

The Forum noted the RBWM submission to the Airports Commission regarding the Widenoise Community Experience Project (Pilot).

#### ITEM 15 – SASIG UPDATE

The Forum received a verbal update on the activity of the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG). Chris Nash attended the last SASIG meeting to specifically present on RBWM's Widenoise initiative which had been well received.

The Forum noted that the SASIG website was of a very high standard offering quality resources such as their newsletters.



A proposed SASIG meeting was to take place on 14 January 2014, from 11am until 1pm which would comprise of a quick review of the Davies Commission. The Forum agreed it was important that the Borough was represented at the meeting.

#### ITEM 16 – HACC/NOISE AND TRACK KEEPING FORUM UPDATE

The Forum received an update from the Noise and Track Keeping Forum.

It was noted that Heathrow had produced another survey and questionnaire and this had revealed that businesses thought there were too many Local Authority representatives on HACC. However it was noted that the reason for this is they represented a large population. Hounslow, Hillingdon and Spelthorne councils all had three representatives whereas RBWM only had one as the Borough was further away from the airport.

The Forum highlighted that HACC was supposed to represent residents, interested parties and businesses. It was noted there were six independent representatives on HACC. The Forum requested a list of representatives and who they represented.

The Forum questioned whether HACC should be facilitated by Heathrow. However it was clarified that Heathrow organised and financially supported HACC under a statutory obligation.

It was noted that Harjit Hunjan, Community and Business Partnership Manager, had been liaising with Heathrow's careers department to improve links regarding apprenticeships and careers opportunities.

Mr Hooper raised the issue of noise monitors with the Forum. Councillor Beer informed the Forum that mobile noise monitors were being located over periods of three months. The Forum noted that Ham Island had one however no one has analysed the data. Three sites were to be nominated for the 2014 programme with two most probably being sited in Teddington. It was noted that Richings Park had previously used a noise monitor however this had picked up no aircraft noise.

#### ITEM 17 – LAANC UPDATE

The Forum received a verbal update regarding the Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC). It was confirmed that LAANC were busy responding to the Davies Commission.

The Forum noted that reports and recommendations from LAANC had initially been circulated early but over time they had slipped back as they were very busy and were published last minute. However, the responses remained robust and of good quality.

The Forum noted concern that Heathrow may change policy from Easterly preference to a Westerly preference. It was confirmed that this would be considered by the Greater London Authority after the Davies Commission made its recommendation.

### ITEM 18 – HOUNSLOW MEETING FEEDBACK

The Forum received feedback regarding the Hounslow meeting. It was confirmed that Councillor Beer and Mr Gould attended the meeting.

The meeting was described as very productive. It consisted of councillors and environmental officers from neighbouring councils working together to create a coordinated campaign concerning Heathrow between the councils which helped raise publicity and avoid contradiction.

### ITEM 19 – ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Forum formally thanked Mr Gould for his many years of hard work and the enormous help he had provided to the Forum. The Forum wished Mr Gould a happy retirement.

### ITEM 20 – DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that future meetings were scheduled as follows:

19 February 2014  
14 May 2014

All meetings to be held at the Guildhall, Windsor commencing at 7.00pm.

### MEETING

The meeting, which began at 7.00pm ended at 9.35pm.